

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 RAJU T. DAHLSTROM,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

12 Defendants.

Case No. C16-1874RSL

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR REVISION


13 On April 8, 2019, the Court granted the individual defendants' motion for  
14 summary judgment and dismissed plaintiff's wrongful termination in violation of public  
15 policy claim on the grounds that (a) plaintiff failed to respond to defendants' argument  
16 that a wrongful discharge claim cannot be asserted against any entity other than plaintiff's  
17 employer and (b) the nature of the employment contract, the relevant case law, and the  
18 narrowness of the public policy exception to the general rule of at-will employment all  
19 supported dismissal. Dkt. # 92. Plaintiff filed a timely motion for reconsideration and, in  
20 the alternative, requested certification of the issue to the Washington Supreme Court. Dkt.  
21 # 93. The motion was denied. Dkt. # 94. The Court found that plaintiff had offered no  
22 justification for his failure to acknowledge, much less respond, to defendants' argument  
23 that a claim of wrongful discharge in violation of public policy cannot be asserted against  
24 anyone other than the employer and had not shown manifest error in the ruling.

25 Plaintiff now seeks to "revise" the April 8, 2019, summary judgment order under  
26

1 Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), arguing that two recent decisions warrant reconsideration. The  
2 Washington Supreme Court decision on which plaintiff relies is inapposite in that the  
3 issue of whether a wrongful discharge claim can be asserted against anyone other than the  
4 employer was not discussed. See Karstetter v. King County Corrections Guild, \_\_ Wn.2d  
5 \_\_, 2019 WL 3227311 (July 18, 2019) (Karstetter sued the Guild, the entity with which he  
6 had an employment contract). The other decision is from the United States District Court  
7 for the Eastern District of Washington. See Blackman v. Omak Sch. Dist., 2019 WL  
8 2396569 (E.D. Wash. June 6, 2019). Chief Judge Rice's determination that the purposes  
9 of the wrongful discharge tort would be furthered by allowing an employee to sue co-  
10 employees who were involved in the termination does not bind this Court, however. Nor  
11 does the fact that Blackman successfully raised policy and legal arguments in her lawsuit  
12 excuse plaintiff's previous failure to respond in any way to the individual defendants'  
13 argument that a wrongful termination claim cannot be asserted against any entity other  
14 than the employer.

15  
16 The Court declines to reconsider or revise the April 8, 2019, order. Plaintiff's  
17 second request for certification to the Washington Supreme Court is denied.

18  
19 DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of Sept., 2019.

20   
21 Robert S. Lasnik  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26